

**REMARKS**

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated December 15, 2004, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on March 15, 2005. Applicant submits this response to place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-36 are pending in the application and remain pending following entry of this response.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Smith et al.* (U.S. 6,578,078, hereinafter *Smith*). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as follows.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, ... *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *Smith* does not disclose "each and every element as set forth" in the rejected claims. For example, referring first to claim 11, *Smith* does not disclose receiving a change request from a web browser indicating the web browser has detected a change related to a web page for which information is stored in a database, as recited. The Examiner argues that *Smith* discloses this element, referring to Fig. 1, col. 8, line 65 through col. 9, line 9, and col. 13, lines 1-10. However, rather than teaching receiving change requests from a web browser, the cited passages are in fact directed to receiving change requests from a web site author during web site development (e.g., when the web site author moves or deletes a web page). In other words, the Examiner has confused the claimed operations of a web browser with the operations of a website authoring tool taught by *Smith*.

PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010222US1  
MPS Ref. No.: IBMK10222

Further, the Examiner argues that a change request corresponds to a command from a web site author to move or delete a page and that, because the author can use a computer connected to a network, the command is issued from a browser. There is no such support in the teachings of *Smith*. In contrast, *Smith* teaches that the (referential preservation engine-RPE) program modules are preferably part of one or more application programs executed on a personal computer and used in providing a web page authoring environment (see col. 10, lines 16-19).

Referring next to claim 1, *Smith* does not disclose monitoring operations of a web browser program to detect an event indicating a change involving a web page for which information is stored in the database, as recited. The Examiner argues that *Smith* discloses this element, again referring to Fig. 1, col. 8, line 65 through col. 9, line 9, and col. 13, lines 1-10. As stated above, however, the cited passages are in fact directed to receiving change requests from a web site author during web site development, and do not teach monitoring operations of a web browser program to detect an event indicating a change involving a web page.

The Examiner repeats the argument that a change request corresponds to a command from a web site author to move or delete a page and that, because the author can use a computer connected to a network, the command is issued from a browser. However, claim 1 does not recite a change request issued from a browser so this argument is irrelevant to claim 1.

Referring next to claim 21, *Smith* does not disclose a processor configured to, when executing a database update program, update at least one table in the database containing information about a web page in response to receiving a change request from a web browser, the change request containing information indicating the web browser detected a change event related to the web page, as recited. The Examiner argues that the referential preservation engine (RPE) taught in *Smith* corresponds to the database update program. However, the RPE monitors change requests from a web site author during web site development, rather than change requests from a web browser program.

Referring next to claim 29, *Smith* does not disclose automatically accessing each network address on a list of network addresses referenced in the database, determining

PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010222US1  
MPS Ref. No.: IBMK10222

one or more changes in location or content related to a web page associated with each network address accessed, and automatically updating the database according to the one or more changes, as recited. In any case, the Examiner argues that the *Smith* teaches automatically accessing each network address on a list of addresses referenced in a database, referring to Fig. 4 and col. 13, lines 30-50. However, the cited sections are directed to redirecting and do not teach the claimed elements.

While the Examiner states that claim 29 "further includes" an additional element, relative to claims 11 and 1, Applicant would like to clarify that the elements in claim 29 are not included in claims 11 or 1. Further, while claim 33 is not separately addressed, Applicant submits that the elements claimed therein are similar to those of claim 29 and are not taught in *Smith*.

For the reasons state above, Applicant submits *Smith* fails to disclose "each and every element as set forth" in claims 1, 11, 21, 29, and 33. Accordingly, Applicant submits that these claims and their dependents are patentable over *Smith* and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Randol W. Read  
Registration No. 43,876  
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicant